

REMARKS

The examiner is thanked for a thorough examination of the present patent application.

I. DRAWINGS

The drawings were “objected to because in Fig. 4, the reference sign for the resonator under 12a should be changed from ‘26’ to –22– because it is shunt resonator 22 that is under series resonator 12a (see the spec. at page 7, lines 13-16), while the shunt resonator 26 is under series resonator 16a as correctly labeled on the right-hand side of the figure.” Office Action, p. 2.

REPLACEMENT SHEET 2/5 is submitted herewith including the recommended change to Figure 4. Further, for the “Figure 4” legend, font size is increased to match the font size of the legend for other figures.

The drawings were “objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: reference sign ‘10b’ mentioned in the description at section [0034]. It appears that in Fig. 7, reference sign ‘10’ should be changed to –10b–.” Office Action, p. 2.

REPLACEMENT SHEET 4/5 is submitted herewith including the recommended change to Figure 7.

The drawings were “objected to because in Fig. 8, reference sign ‘22b’ should be changed to –22– in order to be consistent with the specification and Fig. 7 (see section [0036]).” Office Action, p. 2.

REPLACEMENT SHEET 5/5 is submitted herewith including the recommended change to Figure 8.

II. CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 were initially filed with the patent application with Independent Claims 1, 16, and 24.

Claims 24 and 25 were previously cancelled as non-elected claims.

Claims 1-7, 10, 12-19, and 22 were rejected under various sections of 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103. Office Action, pp. 3-7. All rejected claims are currently cancelled obviating the rejections.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 20, 21, and 23 were “objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.” Office Action, p. 7.

Each of Claims 8, 9, 11, 20, 21, and 23 are currently amended in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicant respectfully submits that the prior art references made of record and not relied upon do not, individually or in any combination, prevent allowance of the remaining claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing Amendments and Remarks, the applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is in condition for allowance. The applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



D. James Chung
Registration no. 41,678

November 23, 2005

Silicon Edge Law Group LLP
Bernal Corporate Park
6601 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 245
Pleasanton, California 94566-3166

Tel.: (925) 621-2131 / eFax: (925) 621-2132

E-mail: djcLaw@email.com